UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

SERGEANTS BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION HEALTH & WELFARE FUND, et al.,	:	15-CV-6549 (CM)
Plaintiffs,	:	
v.	:	October 9, 2018
ACTAVIS, PLC, et al.,	:	500 Pearl Street
Defendants.	:	New York, New York

TRANSCRIPT OF CIVIL CAUSE FOR DISCOVERY CONFERENCE
BEFORE THE HONORABLE ROBERT W. LEHRBURGER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

APPEARANCES:

For the Plaintiffs:
PETER SAFIRSTEIN, ESQ.
ELIZABETH METCALF, ESQ.
MARVIN MILLER, ESQ. (via telephone)
Safirstein Metcalf LLP
The Empire State Building
350 Fifth Avenue, 59th Floor
New York, New York 10118

For the Forest and Merz Defendants:
MARTIN MICHAEL TOTO, ESQ.
HEATHER McDEVITT, ESQ.
White & Case LLP (New York)
1221 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020

Court Transcriber:
SHARI RIEMER, CET-805
TypeWrite Word Processing Service
211 N. Milton Road
Saratoga Springs, New York 12866

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service

APPEARANCES CONTINUED:

For Dr. Reddy's Laboratories, Ltd.:	JONATHAN BERMAN, ESQ. Jones Day (DC) 51 Louisiana Avenue, NW Washington, DC 20001
For Amneal and Sun Defendants:	ALLIE STRANG, ESQ. White & Case LLP (New York) 1221 Avenue of the Americas New York, New York 10020
For Wockhardt Defendants:	DAMON SUDEN, ESQ. Kelley Drye & Warren, LLP (New York) 101 Park Avenue New York, New York 10178
For Teva, Barr, and Cobalt Defendants:	SARAH FREDERICK, ESQ. Goodwin Procter, LLP (Boston) 53 State Street, Exchange Place Boston, Massachusetts 02109
For the Direct Purchaser Class:	BRUCE GERSTEIN, ESQ. Garwin Gerstein & Fisher 88 Pine Street, 10th Floor New York, New York 10005

THE CLERK: We're in the matter for a discovery conference, 15-CV-6549, Sergeants Benevolent Association and parties versus Actavis, PLC, and parties.

Attorneys, please state your name for the record.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: Good afternoon, Your Honor. I'm Peter Safirstein from Safirstein Metcalf, LLP, on behalf of the plaintiffs.

MS. METCALF: Elizabeth Metcalf, Safirstein Metcalf, LLP.

MR. TOTO: Martin Toto with White & Case. We're here for the Forest and Merz defendants, Your Honor.

MS. McDEVITT: Good afternoon, Your Honor. Heather McDevitt of White & Case for the same defendants.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. BERMAN: Jonathon Berman, Your Honor, with Jones Day representing Dr. Reddy's Laboratories.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. STRANG: Allie Strang on behalf of Amneal, Sun, and Upsher.

MR. SUDEN: Damon Suden of Kelley Drye & Warren for the Wockhardt defendants.

MS. FREDERICK: I'm Sarah Frederick. I'm here on behalf of the Teva and Barr defendants. And there's also a pending stipulation and proposed order of substitution to substitute me for White & Case for the Cobalt defendant.

THE COURT: Okay. Granted.

MS. FREDERICK: Thank you.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: Your Honor, as you've heard on the telephone is my co-counsel Marvin Miller (indiscernible).

THE COURT: Okay. Counsel on the phone, can you hear us fine?

MR. MILLER: I can, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MILLER: Thank you.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. MILLER: It's Marvin Miller.

THE COURT: Okay. Is anyone aware of any parties that haven't appeared?

Okay. Good. All right. So we're here mainly because I wanted to just meet everybody and deal with the threshold issue of the schedule that Judge McMahon asked us to get in place. But even before that, I do have before me the stipulated protective order. I've read through it. It looks fine, and I will so order that.

All right. As to the schedule, I have to say Judge McMahon did not authorize me to deal with this all the way through trial yet. So I'm not prepared to enter a schedule that's through trial, so I am much more inclined towards the IPP, the indirect purchasers' schedule. But I'd like to know whether if that is adopted whether it presents any concerns or

issues.

MR. BERMAN: Yes, Your Honor. Jonathan Berman for the manufacturing, sorry, the generic manufacturing of Dr. Reddy's. And it really does create some very serious concerns for us. You know -- okay. I can certainly appreciate that the Forest defendants have been working this case for 2 ½ years and they're ready to go, they're trial ready. We're still warming up, Your Honor. We do not know who has been asked for documents. We don't know what they're asked for. We don't have any of the documents. We don't have any of the deposition transcripts. We don't even have a list of who was deposed.

We don't have a clear understanding as to what the claims are against us. You read through the complaints, you read through the plaintiffs' motion papers, and it's Forest did this and Forest did that. And they did all these things allegedly to interfere with the ability of my client and with the other generic defendants, interfere with our ability to sell our products. Leading to the question of why are we a defendant here and what exactly are we alleged to have done and how do we fit into the overarching scheme that Forest has alleged to have committed.

So at this point in time, I can appreciate that a party like Forest is able to complete things fairly quickly because they've been through the war. We're not able to do

that. And so the suggestion that I've got and I think the other generic defendants would echo this is we'd like to see the record that's been developed so far. And I don't think there's a problem transmitting it. There's some logistical issues with the protective order Your Honor just signed and complying with the protective order in the other case.

We'd like to see the record. We'd like to understand it. And in order to evaluate it, we'd like to know with guidance from the Court based on our motion to dismiss are we still in the case and, if so, what's the set of facts that's relevant to us. Now that's plenty of work for us to do. I don't know exactly how big the record is, but I'm sure it's dozens and dozens of depositions and it's probably millions of pages of documents. We have a lot to do just to understand what's been done already, and we'll make good use of the time. But we are in no position to, you know, to conclude discovery.

THE COURT: Right. But isn't the whole point of this for the parties to come up to speed to be able to participate in the mediation and don't the plaintiffs face the same issue?

MR. BERMAN: I can't speak for the plaintiffs and whether they have an interest in reviewing the file like that or not or what else they want to do.

THE COURT: Well, that's precisely what Judge

McMahon has asked us to do, isn't it, to be able to have a system in place and a set of procedures to facilitate the parties becoming familiar with the record and having access to the record, conducting non-duplicative discovery perhaps so that they can all knowingly participate in a mediation starting on -- well, after the first of the year, as she puts it?

MR. BERMAN: And that's what my suggestion is designed to do, Your Honor. There is so much in the record already that we think we will learn a great deal by looking at that record. And we don't think that you need to have completed all of discovery before you can engage in settlement discussions. You need to have a good idea of what's going on. But just looking at the record will get us that.

And in terms of non-duplicative discovery, I don't know what that is, Your Honor, because I don't know what discovery has been done. I can go back to my office and I can write out a list of third parties that I might want to subpoena. And for all I know, all of them have already been subpoenaed. I bet most of them have because I'm sure the parties in the dry purchaser case have done a very thorough job. But then I'd want to know what facts supposedly tie my client into the alleged anti-competitive scheme of Forest and the issue of whether or not the generic defendants are tied into the course of conduct that's alleged, has anybody

discovered that?

THE COURT: Is that -- by the way, is that a subject of the pending motion to dismiss?

MR. BERMAN: It certainly is, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So that'll be for Judge McMahon to decide.

MR. BERMAN: Sure. I'm not asking for a ruling on the motion to dismiss.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BERMAN: What I'm saying is that I don't know what set of facts is alleged that would tie Dr. Reddy's, my client, to an alleged scheme to prevent Dr. Reddy's from successfully competing in the marketplace, which is what's alleged. And I don't know what's in the record already in terms of whether people have actually analyzed that issue.

THE COURT: All right. Let me ask this. I have proposals, two of them. Do I have proposals from Dr. Reddy's as to what their alternative would be?

MR. BERMAN: Yes. The alternative is that we get the existing discovery record turned over as soon as the various protective orders allow and we get to work hard on looking at those records and understanding it. And then when the order on the motion to dismiss comes in if we're still in the case, we'll then be in position to spring into action and promptly moved forward on discovery.

THE COURT: So it sounds like then you're asking for the equivalent of a stay of discovery as to you pending a motion to dismiss; would that be fair?

MR. BERMAN: Well, it's fair except that we're going to be working hard. We're not going to the beach, you know, while this is happening.

THE COURT: Understood.

MR. BERMAN: We're looking at formally (indiscernible) the stuff that we've never seen before.

THE COURT: All right. Let me hear from plaintiff on this.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor. You know, we read the judge's order in the same way as you've just described it and that is for us -- excuse me -- and that is for us to come up to speed. And we believe that the order tat we've worked out amongst ourselves that we've submitted is designed to be both efficient and practical and to reach the end where we can get up to speed as quickly as possible.

And we know that it's an enormous amount of work. We're prepared to do that, and we think that we are now on October 9th so we're talking about let's say 2 ½ months to 3 months until the beginning of next year. And as soon as we get those documents, we'll be reviewing the documents and we'll be in a position to make the evaluation and make a determination as to what non-duplicative discovery we ought to

be receiving and to get that as soon as possible so that we can meaningfully participate in the mediation in January or after the beginning of the new year.

With regard to the generics' position on the motion to dismiss, as Your Honor has just pointed out, they've briefed that issue. We'll have an opportunity to put in our papers as well. That'll be an issue before the judge. The one thing that we don't want to have happen is we know that the direct purchasers and that Forest have been at this litigation for three years. We're catching up; the generics are catching up as well. We understand the judge to not want us to hold anything up, and we're committed to not hold anything up. Speaking for the IPP purchasers, we are not going to hold anything up, and we would really hope and suggest that the generics don't hold up the proceedings as well.

And that to the extent that the judge rules that they're in the case and there is a mediation in the beginning of January or soon thereafter, we'll be prepared and we hope they'll be prepared as well.

THE COURT: Is there -- what kind of discovery is going to be required and sort of what's the magnitude of that with respect to the generics that would be non-duplicative?

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: Well, we're really not in a position to address that definitively at this point, but what

I can tell Your Honor from what I understand is that in the discovery that's been produced already, which deals with Forest to a large extent, the generics have been producing discovery as well as third parties. They've had depositions taken and whatever. We, of course, have not seen that. We've heard that.

So once we have an opportunity to review the discovery with regard to the generics part of the case with regard to their witnesses and documents that were produced there, then we'll be in a better position to know that. I might also add, as the Court I'm sure is aware that there was another proceeding all together here and that involved New York State and the Attorney Generals action. What we've asked for is that that record be produced to us as well. And like I said, we're committed to working as hard as we need to work to be sure that we can attend a mediation and meaningfully participate at the beginning of next year.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Before I heard from Forest, I have a question back to Reddy's, which is just tell me is it correct that you have been participating in discovery in the other case or cases?

MR. BERMAN: We received a subpoena, and we produced some documents. We produced a witness for a 30(b)(6) witness for deposition. So in terms of, you know, has Dr. Reddy's produced relevant materials, we have. Whether they think

we're done or not is something we're going to have to figure out later. But that's the only participation we had. We didn't sit in on the 90 other depositions --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BERMAN: -- however many they were. We didn't get anybody else's documents. We didn't -- so, you know, we know what we produced, but we don't know what anybody else on earth produced --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. BERMAN: -- in this case.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. All right. Let me hear from is it Forest, right?

MS. McDEVITT: Yes. Thank you, Your Honor. Heather McDevitt for Forest and the Merz defendants as well. A couple of observations that I think amplify what appeared on our behalf in the joint letter, and they have to do both with the ability to intelligently and productively prepare for a mediation in this case which has not been scheduled and in part, you know, we need to kind of figure out the universe of preparation that we're going to obtain before that could happen but also to be having this case catch up to the DPP case. And there's a couple of reasons why I think that's quite important.

So let me start with the mediation. A real deficit that in our view appears in the proposed scheduling order that

the IPP plaintiffs have submitted to Your Honor is that it's pretty much a one-way street. And, in fact, I think if you look at the truly non-duplicative discovery that's going to be needed in this case and that would allow us both to catch this case up for purposes of perhaps an eventual trial but certainly for a productive mediation is discovery that we're going to need to take of the IPPs.

And in large part that discovery is going to be grounded in the differences between the IPP and DPP plaintiffs as it relates both to damage theories, damage modeling, and class cert. These are not one size fits all treatment. In either case, there are going to be significant issues in terms of, you know, passthrough and downstream discovery and ways in which perhaps the overlapping or duplicative damages need to be sorted out. This is complex in pharmaceutical payment chain, you know, worlds.

And in order for us to be able to mediate in an intelligent way, that is information that we think we need, that we're entitled to, and that we have tried to account for in the proposed schedule that we've put before you. Same goes for class certification.

When it comes to trial, we think that the parties ought to be able to both be progressing this case productively toward a mediation with the same work that we would be engaged in to meet a pretrial schedule. The reality is that we -- and

we raised this with Judge McMahon at the September 7th scheduling conference -- that there are significant issues as we said earlier relating to potentially inconsistent judgments, duplicative discovery. And we may very well be asking Judge McMahon previewed with her last month for a joint trial of the DPP and IPP cases.

We certainly do not want to be in a position where we get to the worst of both worlds, that we have a mediation, we don't settle, and we haven't advanced this case to the point where it needs to be in order to catch it up for purposes of trial. Now Judge McMahon, of course, didn't rule on that request on September 7th. She did say, yeah, you know, there are some issues here. I need to think about it. But we are concerned about preserving the point and being in a position where we don't sort of have a de factor abandonment of it because we haven't moved this case along in a way that will be satisfactory to Judge McMahon.

She pushed us very hard in the DPP case, Your Honor. We had a very aggressive schedule. We really -- you know, it's been around for a few years, but the past year or so we took that case pretty much all the way through discovery, summary judgment, and class certification. The DPP plaintiffs who are here in the courtroom can attest to that as well. And we are concerned that she will expect this case to progress and that we won't be in a position to have done so without a

more meaningful pretrial schedule like the one that we submitted last week to Your Honor.

She did at the September 7th scheduling conference reference a spring 2019 trial. Unclear as to, you know, what that meant, DPPs, DPPs plus IPPS. But that was the general time frame that she referenced and so we've kept that in mind as well.

THE COURT: In terms of the one-way street, I didn't quite get that. Where's the one-way street because the schedule proposed by the plaintiffs includes production by parties generally. It's not limited to one party.

MS. McDEVITT: That's right, but it's got no expert discovery.

THE COURT: Well, I realize that. I mean that to me is a separate issue, right, because there's been no expert discovery form either side; is that right?

MS. McDEVITT: Well, not in the IPP case --

THE COURT: Right.

MS. McDEVITT: -- and the DPP case.

THE COURT: Right.

MS. McDEVITT: The case is fully teed up. But we think that in order to be in a position both to move the case along and to mediate, we've got to go through that process.

THE COURT: Yeah. I don't know that experts are necessary for the mediation, but I do have concerns about

holding things up from what would otherwise be the normal course and certainly would not want Judge McMahon to find the parties and herself in a position where mediation wasn't successful for some reason and then all of a sudden find out that there's work to be done that wasn't done at all.

So I do have some concern about that. Plaintiff, why shouldn't we go ahead and at least schedule expert discovery at least for perhaps after the first of the year?

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: Well, a couple of different things. First of all, with regard to the issue of the one-way street, as Your Honor pointed out, we're not looking at it as a one-way street. We understand that they're going to want to depose our client and they'll want to take some discovery. And that's fine. And we will certainly produce our client timely, and they will have that opportunity.

With regard to experts, let's just take a step back for a second. And as I said earlier, I think the aim here, at least from our perspective from what we understand the judge to be asking from us, is to be, as I said earlier, efficient and practical. So there are different ways that one can go about doing that, particularly with regard to experts. For example, with regard to a mediation we will be putting in a mediation statement as will all of the parties over here. We have been down this road before in other cases. Every -- I would imagine that every attorney who's in this room

practically has had similar experiences and we know how to do this. We can put in -- and we've done this in other cases where we've put in information with regard to class cert and information with regard to some expert analysis, for example on damages into a mediation statement. We can do that in front of the mediator. We'll put in our statement. They can meaningfully oppose, and we can put in this information without having a full-blown expert discovery.

If we go down the road of full-blown expert discovery, which if we go to trial, we certainly will have to do, the reality is we're talking about months. We're talking about making this virtually impossible to have any kind of meaningful mediation at the beginning of next year. Now if the Court wants meaningful mediation beginning of next year, then we think that the formula to get there is to allow the parties who weren't participating before to catch up as quickly as possible to do a more abbreviated analysis of some of these issues that my opponent is talking about right now dealing with, for example, expert discovery and class certification because those issues need to properly be before the Court and we can put them there as I said in a more truncated abbreviated practical way through a mediation statement.

If the case settles, then this is resolved. If the case doesn't settle, then we need full-blown discovery. And

we're back in front of you or in front of the Court talking about a schedule that contemplates all those different issues.

THE COURT: All right. Okay.

MS. McDEVITT: You know, just one point, Your Honor, and not to belabor it. Our view is that it's more practical and efficient not to do it twice and that we have the ability to test both damages modeling and class cert through a regular expert discovery process that in turn could make the mediation that much more productive. But to sort of go through mediation statements and have our experts and their experts too do a little analysis not a full analysis and it doesn't work and then we go back to expert -- it just seems wasteful and inefficient. And so we would just like to do it all at once.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: I mean I think the opposite.

THE COURT: I know. I see someone standing back there.

MR. GERSTEIN: Judge, I'm Bruce Gerstein from Garwin Gerstein & Fisher. I represent the direct purchaser class. If I could just --

THE COURT: Welcome.

MR. GERSTEIN: If I can approach.

THE COURT: Sure.

MR. GERSTEIN: I just wanted to give you our perspective because just for some background since we have

been litigating very aggressively for at least three years I would say. It seems longer.

THE COURT: Sure it does.

MR. GERSTEIN: We've been, you know, through quite a bit. We're trial ready. We've been trial ready since January. The judge had ordered us as of last January to be fully ready for to be on the trial list. The only thing that's pending is that she has a rule that limine motions are five days after the last pretrial conference. But everything else including the pretrial statements, the exhibit lists, the deposition designations and everything else has been done.

The just had told us at the September 7th conference two things. One is that after having decided the motions for summary judgment which she happened to advise us very clearly that it ruined her summer, not ours but hers. She ruined our last holidays overall. But she did say a couple of things. One is that she's not going to delay this. She's going to allow us to go to the trial in the spring if we can settle it. And we should do mediation as quickly as possible and she said, at worst, you know, right after the end of this year.

So we're ready to go and what we're concerned about is delaying the whole process, you know, and just having to repeat everything. We've had a very, very extensive discovery period. Obviously, you see from the Court's opinion that there was quite a bit from both sides of, you know, of work

done. You have a very, very extensive summary judgment record with most probably hundreds of exhibits and deposition designations, et cetera that was presented to the judge.

So they have everything for the most part for the liability part of the case. She just felt that there was some additional information that they may need personally to come up to speed if they're going to get involved in the same mediation that we would be in.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. GERSTEIN: And that's our concern is from a pure self-interest if we can't settle it, we want it on trial as quickly as possible.

THE COURT: Uh-huh.

MR. GERSTEIN: And we're not -- we'd do everything we can to resist delaying this case for trial, and that was something that was communicated very strongly by Judge McMahon.

THE COURT: Understood. All right. Is there anyone else who wants to weigh in before I come back to Dr. Reddy's counsel there?

MS. FREDERICK: I'm Sarah Frederick for the Teva and Barr defendants and for Cobalt as well. I'll speak into the mic. THE COURT: Okay. That would be helpful.

MS. FREDERICKS: I just -- you had asked Dr. Reddy's counsel if there'd been any discovery of his client, and I

just wanted to let you know that there's been discovery of my client as well in the DPP case but we're similarly situated in that we were a third party in that case.

THE COURT: I see.

MS. FREDERICKS: And so we are similarly really behind the starting line --

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. FREDERICKS: -- in terms of understanding the theories in this case, including the theories against us.

THE COURT: Okay. Understood. I believe Counsel for Dr. Reddy's wanting to say one more thing.

MR. BERMAN: Sure. I mean I appreciate that the parties in the direct purchaser action are trial ready and they've got all these statements which we've never seen. Maybe if we read them, we would learn more about at least what a different set of plaintiffs was bringing against a different set of defendants. We still wouldn't exactly know what our case is.

I just wanted to say a couple of things. One is we're in no position to start expert discovery. We need to start looking at the record that's out there to understand what there is and just doing that is absolutely necessary in order to get to a mediation. I mean right now, you know, if I were to talk to my clients, you know, what are the claims against us, I don't really know. What's the evidence against

us? I have no idea. There's four million pages. I don't know if any of them talk about us or not. Who wants us at a mediation? Well, so far nobody. Nobody's actually invited us to a mediation. You know, we got out of the blue the judge's order, how about a mediation. And the mediation talks about them and them and them. It doesn't talk about us. I mean, you know, I think it's fine. If those guys want to go ahead and mediate and settle and try and fine. But we're not ready. We can't do that.

THE COURT: Does plaintiff think that mediation could go forward without the generic defendants?

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: It could. Our clear preference is that it not. But if the Court were to say that the only way to go forward at this point would be to go forward to separate it and to have it as far as first and generic second, if that's what the Court would rule, then that's what the Court rules, but that's not our preference.

THE COURT: And what about Forest? Do you have a position on that?

MR. TOTO: I don't know that we have a specific position as we sit here right now. Our position is that we can't even at this point decide whether we would agree to a mediation with the IPPs. That has not been agreed. Our position is that --

THE COURT: Isn't Judge McMahon sort of expecting

that?

MR. TOTO: Well, she has ordered us to do -- to consider mediation, I believe. I'm not sure that we can be forced to pay for a mediation with a party that we don't want to mediate with, but I'm not 100 percent sure.

THE COURT: Well, according to her order, it says, "Before setting a trial date, the DPPs and Forest have advised the Court they are amenable to mediation."

MR. TOTO: Well, we said we were amenable to considering mediation at the September 7th with the DPPs. That's what we said. It was discussed whether we should have a joint trial with the IPPs and we think we should, at least at this point in time. But our position now is we kind of like the generic defendants, we don't know what their allegations are against us. They've said they're not bringing a claim for a reverse payment under Actavis, which was the basis of the DPPs' claim or at least half of their claim. We don't know if they have a certifiable class. We don't know what their damages model looks like.

As we sit here now, we can't say that any mediation with the DPP -- the IPPs would be productive at all. We have to go through that process to see if they have a certifiable class, to see if they have any cognizable damages. And then we can consider whether it makes sense to mediate, whether it makes sense to mediate as one big party here or individually.

But those decisions, it's our position, can't be made right now in a vacuum, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. I'm going to rule. So, I am guided by Judge McMahon's order which is very specific and it says we are to set things in motion for the parties to -- to get the parties to the IPP case up to speed so that they can participate meaningfully in a mediation that will be scheduled after the first of the year. That requires getting everyone access to the record that so far has not had it. And it requires non-duplicative discovery as Judge McMahon has ordered.

And these are the two issues or two groups of material that the order proposed by the plaintiffs addresses. So I am going to enter their order. If any party, particularly the generic defendants, have any particular difficulty with any specific item or material that raises an issue that really creates an impossibility, bring that to my attention. I'm sure we can work through it. But I am going to enter the schedule entered by the -- offered by the plaintiffs.

Anything else?

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: Thank you, Your Honor.

MR. BERMAN: Well, I hate to take advantage of your offer already.

THE COURT: I didn't say you could do it now.

MR. BERMAN: Well, I --

THE COURT: But, actually, I do have to get back to a settlement conference. But could you just give me a highlight?

MR. BERMAN: Well, we're supposed to serve our non-duplicative discovery request in two weeks with -- and sitting here today, I don't even know what has been served in the other case at all. I have no idea how to figure out what is duplicative and what is non-duplicative.

THE COURT: Well, what's the deadline for the --

MR. BERMAN: October 26th.

THE COURT: Hold on.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: It was -- it's the 14th. I'm sorry. It's the 12th. The contemplation was that they would give us the record --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: -- by the 12th, give us two weeks --

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SAFIRSTEIN: -- to review it and to --

THE COURT: Exactly. And is access going to be given on the 12th?

MS. McDEVITT: Yes, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. McDEVITT: Yeah. I mean there's -- I mean we've

got the five motions, exhibits, pleadings. That will be produced. We have some consent issues with third parties under the DPP protective order. We've given notice to those parties. We can produce information that doesn't fall under those consent issues if we haven't gotten it. They've got 30 days to consent. We've told those parties that we're before you today, and we're trying to move that process along.

THE COURT: And will the discovery requests themselves be included in what is in this material to which there is access?

MS. McDEVITT: The request and responses.

THE COURT: Responses.

MS. McDEVITT: Yes.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. McDEVITT: We can provide that.

THE COURT: All right. Well, let's -- we're going to leave it as-is for the moment. Let's see what you get access to, how overwhelming it may or may not be, and we can take it from there. But this is the schedule that's going in. All right. Anything else?

UNIDENTIFIED ATTORNEY: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you all. We're adjourned.

* * * * *

I certify that the foregoing is a court transcript from an electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

Shari Riemer, CET-805

Dated: December 9, 2018